



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/954,775	09/18/2001	Michael Orlando Cimini	I3DVI3971	7795
29399	7590	01/26/2007	EXAMINER	
JOHN S. BEULICK (12729) C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE SUITE 2600 ST. LOUIS, MO 63102-2740			VAN DOREN, BETH	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3623		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		01/26/2007		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/954,775

Applicant(s)

CIMINI ET AL.

Examiner

Beth Van Doren

Art Unit

3623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
 13. Other: _____

Beth Van Doren
AU 3623
Patent Examiner

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to claims 1, 9, and 15 add a limitation concerning the basis for the suggestions, which was not previously considered and thus requires further search and/or consideration.

Advisory Action

1. The following advisory action is in response to communications received 1/03/2007.
2. Applicant's arguments with regards to the rejections based on Powers et al. (U.S. 6,604,084) in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. 6,625,511) have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that neither Powers et al. or Suzuki et al., considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest a system for evaluating process performance, wherein a server is configured to display at least one suggestion for improving performance of the desired manufacturing function, where the at least one suggestion is sortable based on the categories of the production process.

In response to this argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner relied on Powers et al. to disclose the display of information useful in determining the overall performance and identifying ways to improve performance, where results and information of Powers are sortable based on filters associated with categories of the process. See at least column 4, lines 25-35, column 5, lines 10-30, column 6, line 66-column 7, line 11, and column 13, lines 25-50 and 63-67, which discloses identifying ways to improve performance and sorting output based on categories and performance areas. Examiner expressly stated that Powers et al. does not disclose that the desired function is a manufacturing function or displaying at least one suggestion for improving performance, wherein the suggestions are sortable.

Suzuki et al. discloses manufacturing functions and displaying at least one suggestion for improving performance, wherein the suggestions are sortable. See figure 11, column 7, lines 60-67, column 12, lines 30-40 and 60-67, column 19, lines 15-35, column 20, lines 55-63, which

Art Unit: 3623

discloses evaluating a manufacturing process and/or function and displaying point by point suggestions for improvement. See specifically column 20, lines 54-67, which discloses sorting the results and displaying improvements in descending order. Examiner notes that the fact that the process is a manufacturing function is intended use, which does not result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art, and thus does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.

Thus, the combination of Powers et al. in view of Suzuki et al. does teach and suggest each and every limitation of the claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (571) 272-6737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

lwd

bvd

January 24, 2007

Beth Van Dren
AU 3623
Patent Examiner